

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 15, 2008.

Claims 1, 7, 15, 18, 24, 31, 36 and 42 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-46 remain pending in this application.

Applicant brings to the attention of the Examiner the Non-Final Office Action Response filed April 10, 2008 and the Non-final Office action mailed on July 3, 2008 for U.S. Application No. 11/496,199 (Attorney Docket No. 303.846US2), which is assigned to Examiner Suzanne Lo.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 15-29, 31-34, 36-40, 42-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 95/06285 to Petersen (hereinafter, "the Peterson reference") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107929 to Soussin *et al.* (hereinafter, "the Soussin reference"). Claims 1-8 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,809,253 to Gallagher *et al.* (hereinafter, "the Gallagher reference") in view of the Petersen reference and the Soussin reference. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gallagher reference in view of the Petersen reference and the Soussin reference as applied to claim 7, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0167829 to Friedman *et al.* (hereinafter, "the Friedman reference"). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gallagher reference, the Petersen reference, and the Soussin reference as applied to claim 7, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0016877 to Dancs *et al.* (hereinafter, "the Dancs reference"). Claims 30, 35, 41 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Petersen reference in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0035845 to Zwern (hereinafter, "the Zwern reference") and the Soussin reference. Applicants disagree with the foregoing stated grounds of rejection and desire to further clarify various distinctions of the present invention over the cited art. Reconsideration of the present application is therefore requested in light of the present amendment and following remarks.

In the following discussion, the disclosed embodiments of the invention may be discussed in comparison to the prior art. It is understood, however, that any discussion of the disclosed embodiments, as well as any discussion of the differences between the disclosed

embodiments of the present invention and the prior art do not define the scope or interpretation of any of the claims. Instead, such discussed differences, if presented, are offered merely to help the Examiner appreciate important claim distinctions as they are discussed.

The Peterson reference is again cited for allegedly disclosing a data aligner. In particular, the Examiner has cited Table 1 in the Peterson reference, and specifically the data entries shown in Table 1. Referring to Table 1 in the Peterson reference, Applicants note that the data in Table 1 is not aligned in a contiguous and abutting form. For example, Applicants note the existence of an unoccupied lane on the right-hand half of Table 1, so that bytes 04, 03, 02 and 01 are non-contiguous, and do not abut the bytes 08, 07, 06 and 05, respectively. Similarly, Table 1 shows a gap between bytes 12, 11, 10 and 09 and the bytes 16, 15, 14 and 13, respectively, which includes two unoccupied lanes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Peterson reference fails to disclose or suggest contiguous and abutting alignment of data, as asserted by the Examiner.

Turning now to the claims, differences between the claim language and the applied references will be specifically pointed out. Claim 15, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “An apparatus for assembling and sending data comprising... *allocating one or more first contiguous lanes within a first section of a data block to at least some of the local data*, wherein the data block comprises a set of multiple lanes, and each lane includes a set of configurable bits... *allocating one or more second contiguous lanes within a second section of the data block to at least some of the downstream data*, wherein the first section and the second section are *contiguous and abutting*...” (Emphasis added). The Peterson reference fails to disclose or suggest a contiguous and abutting ordering of the data. The Soussin reference fails to remedy this shortcoming. Claim 15 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 15 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 18, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “An apparatus for sending data over a communications bus, the apparatus comprising... *providing a first header for the first source data and a second header for the second source data*, sending the first source data and the first header over the communications bus, identifying a first breakpoint corresponding to an end of the first source data, *sending the second source data and the second header over the*

communications bus, wherein the second header is positioned contiguously with the end of the first source data...sending the second source data and the second header over the communications bus, wherein the second header is positioned contiguously and abuts the end of the first source data...". (Emphasis added). Again, the Peterson reference fails to disclose or suggest contiguous and abutting ordering of the data. The Soussin reference fails to remedy this shortcoming. Claim 18 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 18 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 24, as amended, recites in pertinent part: "A method for sending data on a communications bus, the method comprising... arranging a first portion of second source data within a second section of the data block structure during the second processing period, *wherein the second section is contiguous and abuts the first section*, and the second section includes a second set of contiguous bits, *wherein the first portion of the second source data includes a second header portion that is positioned between the first section and the second section...*" (Emphasis added). As discussed above, the Peterson reference fails to disclose or suggest this. Further, the Soussin reference fails to remedy this shortcoming. Claim 24 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 24 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 31, as amended, recites in pertinent part: "A method comprising...*generating at least one header...allocating one or more first contiguous lanes within a first section of a data block* to at least some of the first source data, wherein the data block comprises a set of multiple lanes, and each lane includes a set of configurable bits...*allocating one or more second contiguous lanes within a second section of the data block* to at least some of the second source data, wherein the second section begins at a next lane, *which is contiguous and abutting the first section...and...sending*, over a communications bus and during a data block transmission period, the at least a portion of the first source data within the first section of the data block, and the at least a portion of the second source data within the second section of the data block, *wherein the header is positioned between the at least some of the first source data and the at least some of the second source data.*". (Emphasis added). Yet again, the Peterson reference fails to disclose

or suggest this. Further, the Soussin reference fails to remedy this shortcoming. Claim 31 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 31 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 36, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “A method comprising...arranging first source data from a first source within a first section of a data block structure, wherein the first source data includes a first header portion, and wherein the data block structure includes a fixed number of contiguous, configurable bits, and data within the data block structure is periodically sent out on a communications bus...arranging the at least a portion of the second source data within the data block structure according to the indication, resulting in the at least a portion of the second source data occupying a second section of the data block *that is contiguous and abutting the first section...*” (Emphasis added). The cited combination of Peterson and Soussin fail to disclose or fairly suggest this. Claim 36 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 36 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 42, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “A method comprising...arranging first source data within a first section of a data block structure, *wherein the first source data includes a first header portion*, and wherein the data block structure includes fixed number of contiguous, configurable bits...receiving a request to send second source data over a communications bus, *wherein the second source data includes a second header portion...*identifying a location of a breakpoint in the first source data...arranging at least a portion of the second source data within a second section of the data block structure after the breakpoint, *wherein the second section is contiguous and abuts an end of the first section...*and...sending the first source data and the at least a portion of the second source data over the communications bus during a data block transmission period.” (Emphasis added). Again, the cited combination of Peterson and Soussin fail to disclose or suggest this. Claim 42 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 42 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 1-8 and 12-14, the Examiner has cited the Gallagher reference for disclosing, *inter-alia*, a processor and multiple memory modules.

Applicants note that the Gallagher reference fails to remedy the shortcomings in the Peterson and Soussin references. In particular, the Gallagher reference fails to disclose, or to fairly suggest, *inter-alia*, contiguous and abutting ordering of the data.

Returning again to the claim language, specific differences between the applied references and the claim language will be specifically pointed out. Claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “An electronic system comprising...multiple memory modules, operatively coupled together through a communications bus, which return data requested in the one or more memory access requests, wherein each of the multiple memory modules is a data source, and a memory module of the multiple memory modules...determines that first source data and second source data are available...*generates a header for at least one of the first source data and the second source data...allocates one or more first contiguous lanes within a first section of a data block to at least some of the first source data*, wherein the data block comprises a set of multiple lanes, and each lane includes a set of configurable bits...*allocates one or more second contiguous lanes within a second section of the data block to at least some of the second source data, wherein the second section begins at a next lane, which is contiguous and abutting with the first section...*” (Emphasis added). The cited combination still fails to disclose this. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims depending from claim 1 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 7, as amended, recites in pertinent part: “A memory module comprising... one or more memory storage units for storing local data...and...a hub, operatively coupled to the one or more memory storage units and to a communications bus over which the hub can receive downstream data from one or more other hubs, wherein the hub...*generates a header for at least one of the first source data and the second source data...allocates one or more first contiguous lanes within a first section of a data block to at least some of the first source data*, wherein the data block comprises a set of multiple lanes, and each lane includes a set of configurable bits...*allocates one or more second contiguous lanes within a second section of the data block to at least some of the second source data, wherein the second section begins at a next lane, which is contiguous and abuts the first section...*” (Emphasis added). Again, the cited combination still fails to disclose this. Claim 7 is therefore allowable over the cited combination. Claims

depending from claim 7 are similarly allowable based upon the allowable form of the base claims and further based upon the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

With respect to the Examiner's rejections based upon the Freidman, Dancs and Zwern references, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing references still do not remedy the shortcomings present in the Peterson, Soussin and Gallagher references, as discussed in detail above.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 10/688,461

Filing Date: October 17, 2003

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR SENDING DATA FROM MULTIPLE SOURCES OVER A COMMUNICATIONS BUS

Page 19
Doc#: 303.858US1

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (612) 373-6900 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES W. MEYER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6900

Date 7/15/08

By

Steven Arterberry
Steven Arterberry
Reg. No. 46,314

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 15th day of July, 2008.

Name

Amy Moriarty

[Signature]